Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOUIS JOSEPH TENWINKLE, Plaintiff,

v.

RICHARDSONS BAY REGIONAL AGENCY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-09081-JSW

ORDER VACATING HEARING AND ORDERING PLAINTIFF TO SHOW **CAUSE**

Re: Dkt. No. 17

On April 4, 2022, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. Under the Northern District Civil Local Rules, Plaintiff's response to that motion should have been due on April 18, 2022. Although this case was reassigned, the reassignment did not alter the briefing schedule. (See Dkt. No. 21.) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an opposition.

The Court VACATES the hearing scheduled for May 27, 2022, and it HEREBY ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why the Court should not grant Defendant's motion as unopposed or, alternatively, why the Court should not dismiss the matter for failure to prosecute.

If Plaintiff seeks to file an untimely opposition, he must file a motion for leave to late file with his proposed opposition brief. Plaintiff's response to this Order to Show Cause and any request to belatedly oppose Defendants' motion shall be filed by May 17, 2022. If Plaintiff fails to respond by that date, the Court shall dismiss this case without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

//

25 //

// 26

// 27

28 //

Case 4:21-cv-09081-JSW Document 28 Filed 05/04/22 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court

If Plaintiff does respond and the Court permits him to belatedly oppose the motion, the Court will set a deadline for Defendants to reply.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 4, 2022

JEFFREY S. WHITE United States District Judge